The remarkable increase[1] shown in production since 1930 is partly, no doubt, due to the poor harvests in the 1926–30 period and also to the effects of the agricultural reforms carried out immediately after the War, which had scarcely had time to appear by 1930. But, both in Estonia and Latvia, the shortage of exchange induced the Government to encourage the farmers to bring more land under grain, particularly wheat, which to a large extent had been imported before this period. The average acreage under the four principal cereal crops increased by 5·1 per cent. in Estonia, 7·3 per cent. in Lithuania, and as much as 10·9 per cent. in Latvia, as between 1926–30 and 1931–5, and production of wheat was nearly doubled in Estonia between 1926–30 and 1931–5, more than doubled in Latvia. There was also a heavy increase in rye production;[2] and, as will be seen, both countries have practically ceased to import grain in normal years. Agricultural efficiency, too, has increased; in every case but one in the above table there was a rise in the yield per ha. as between 1926–30 and 1931–5. Government assistance, especially in technical education, the provision of seed, and the drainage of marsh land, was largely responsible for this development.

Progress during these years was similar as regards most of the other principal crops, especially potatoes, where there was a remarkable increase both in production and yield:

TABLE 34. *Potato Production*

	Area under crop (thousand ha.)				*Production (thousand quintals)*				*Yield (quintals per ha.)*			
	Average 1926–30	*Average 1931–5*	*Year 1936*	*Year 1937**	*Average 1926–30*	*Average 1931–5*	*Year 1936*	*Year 1937**	*Average 1926–30*	*Average 1931–5*	*Year 1936*	*Year 1937**
Estonia	67	70	74	76	7,570	8,743	10,306	9,160	113·0	124·9	139·3	120·5
Latvia	85	106	120	127	8,458	13,363	16,115	17,817	99·2	123·7	134·3	140·3
Lithuania	141	175	179	184	15,961	20,013	21,106	25,088	106·2	114·4	115·9	136·3

* 1937: provisional figures only.

The cultivation of flax tended to decrease somewhat, owing largely to unfavourable conditions in international markets, particularly to the competition from Russia. The decrease would no doubt have been greater but for the fact that the textile industries of Estonia and Latvia tended to increase their consumption of flax after 1931 in order to save foreign exchange. The figures are shown in Table 35. On the other hand, a really important development was the growth in the cultivation of sugar-beet in Latvia and Lithuania. This was greatly encouraged by the establishment of sugar-beet factories

[1] It will be noted, however, that the harvest of 1936 was well below the 1931–5 average.

[2] In Estonia the Government has encouraged rye-growing since 1930 by purchasing the surplus crop during the autumn at fixed prices.

1: Anonymous U-4 (no date)1938 RB1 Baltic State

[248]

TABLE 35. *Flax Production*

(In thousand quintals)

	Average 1926–30	*Average 1931–5*	*Year 1936*	*Year 1937**
Estonia . . .	95	65	87	113
Latvia . . .	196	152	185	257
Lithuania . . .	339	214	288	308

* 1937: provisional figures only.

257 under Government assistance. By the end of 1936 there were two
249 such factories in operation in Lithuania and four in Latvia, and the
483 production of beet sugar had increased in Lithuania to an annual average of 128,000 quintals for 1931–5 as against practically nothing in the preceding five years. In Latvia the increase was from an annual average of 29,000 quintals in 1926–30 to 315,000 quintals in 1931–5.. In 1936 Lithuania's production was 243,000 quintals, and Latvia's 382,000; and imports of sugar in both countries had been reduced to almost negligible figures.

4. DAIRY FARMING AND STOCK-BREEDING

439 It has been seen how during the earlier period dairy farming and
234 stock-breeding existed largely for the export trade. The general
231 decrease of foreign trade as the result of the crisis, therefore, made it especially important for the Baltic States to give further encouragement to this branch of activity. But a large proportion of the exports of Estonia and Latvia had been taken by the United Kingdom and Germany; and it was consequently inevitable that, owing to the trade policies pursued by these countries, particularly the latter, there should be some decrease in production. Lithuania, on the other hand, did not enter the field as a producer on a large scale until just before the beginning of the crisis, and was, therefore, able to profit by the mistakes of the other countries. As the result, there has been an almost spectacular increase in her production both of butter and of bacon; and, whereas her exports of these commodities before 1930 could not be compared with those of the other two countries, she is now by far the largest bacon exporter of the three, though it is true that her exports have recently fallen off. Lithuania also exports more butter now than Estonia, and nearly as much as Latvia. For this the energetic policy pursued by the co-operative system is largely responsible, since the production and marketing both of bacon and butter is entirely in the hands of this organization.

The reason why it has been possible for Lithuania to succeed in spite of the fact that, unlike Estonia and Latvia, she has refused to depreciate her currency, is, perhaps, that the general standard of